

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Wyoming



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@ed.gov

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at carlas.mccauley@ed.gov.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Wyoming Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 2300 Capitol Avenue Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: David Holbrook Position and Office: Supervisor, Federal Programs Division Contact's Mailing Address: 2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 1st Floor Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050 Telephone: (307) 777-6260 Fax: (307) 777-7633 Email address: dholbr@educ.state.wy.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Cindy Hill, State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Telephone: (307) 777-7675
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</p>

<p align="center">Defining and Identifying Wyoming’s Tier I, II and III Schools</p> <p align="center">In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting persistently lowest-achieving schools, Wyoming has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding.</p> <p align="center">In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under</p>
--

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools, the basis for the identification of those schools is as follows:

Identifying Tier I Schools

Tier I schools consist of the following:

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

1. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier II Schools

Tier II schools consist of the following:

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

1. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier III Schools

Tier III schools consist of the following:

Is any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; or

1. Is a Title I eligible school among the lowest quintile (20%) of performance based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; and

2. Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

Ranking of Schools Methodology

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' Academic Achievement (performance) on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

1. **Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade:** The statewide percentage of students testing proficient in each grade. All students tested in Wyoming public schools are included.
2. **Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient:** As testing for each grade level is independent of testing at other grade levels, the enrollment-by-grade makeup of each school must be taken into account to create a performance measure that will be valid for performance comparison of all Wyoming schools. To accomplish this need, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values for each grade served by a school are averaged, weighted by the percentage of students enrolled in each grade served.

a. Examples:

- i. Suppose that Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade is 50% for fourth grade and 60% for fifth grade.
- ii. Example 1: A school serves only the fourth and fifth grades with enrollment of 50 fourth grade students and 50 fifth grade students.
 1. Half (50%) the students are enrolled in fourth grade, and half are enrolled in fifth grade.
 2. With equal enrollment weighting (half the 100 total students are in each grade), the weighted average target likewise becomes the halfway point between the fourth grade and fifth grade Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values (50% and 60%, respectively). This halfway point, the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient, is then 55%.
 - a. Mathematically, this 55% weighted average is calculated as [(50 fourth grade students * 50% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade) + (50 fifth grade students * 60% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fifth grade)] divided

by 100 students total enrolled in the school.

iii. Example 2: A school serves only the fourth grade, with a total enrollment of 100 fourth grade students.

1. With all 100 students enrolled in fourth grade, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade of 50% becomes the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient for the school.

3. **Relative Proficiency Performance:** The comparative final metric, this is the difference between the percent of students proficient in a school and the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient applicable to the school's particular enrollment-by-grade makeup.

- a. Relative Proficiency Performance values are calculated as positive or negative percentages. The higher a positive percentage, the better a school's performance on current year testing. The lower a negative percentage, the more a school is in need of improvement.
- b. Relative Proficiency Performance values are then ranked. The higher the percentage, the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the percentage, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' Progress in performance on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

1. As described within Wyoming's Academic Achievement metric overview, the Relative Proficiency Performance values are calculated by subject and school year for each Wyoming school.
2. **Performance Trend Value:** A three year performance trend value (linear regression slope) is then calculated for each school.
 - a. A positive Performance Trend Values indicates that a school has a positive three year performance trend (performance is increasing). Likewise, a negative value indicates a decreasing performance trend. The higher the Performance Trend Value, the larger the relative three year performance gain trend, and vice-versa.
 - b. Performance Trend Value figures are then ranked. The higher the figure

the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the figure, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Overall ranking of schools then takes place as follows:

1. **School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking:** The average of the four calculated Academic Achievement and Progress rankings:
 - a. Math Academic Achievement Ranking
 - b. Reading Academic Achievement Ranking
 - c. Math Progress Ranking
 - d. Reading Progress Ranking
2. Methodology remains the same across the four component rankings and the final School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking in that the higher the ranking, the lower the performance and the greater the need for improvement.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

☐ **SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Part 1

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with

specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.*

Embedded within the application are the questions the LEA will need to answer to show that they have analyzed the needs of their school, what School Intervention Model they have chosen, and why they chose that model.

In determining their needs, the LEA should review the school's NCA Profile, analyze the school's PAWS data, and data from one other rigorous district-based assessment commonly used within that district. The LEA should also go through the questions contained in B (2) and answer them to help determine what School Intervention Model is best suited for the needs of the school. This comprehensive needs assessment should be done through their School Improvement Team which is comprised of school leadership, teachers, and parents – additional members from the LEA Senior Leadership Team should be added in not already in place.

The WDE will provide technical assistance as needed through its SSoS.

- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.*

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School (Wyoming has some small rural LEAs that have a composition of one K-12 school, in these LEAs, the LEA is the school, hence the use of LEA/School throughout this application) will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the following questions concerning the model they wish to implement. Technical assistance by the WDE SSoS will be provided to LEA/Schools to help with the needs assessment to determine if a school can implement a School Intervention Model.

The Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to

- ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
 7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
 8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
 9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
 10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Restart Model

1. Are there qualified CSO, CMO, or EMOs willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

The Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff

replacements?

3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
 11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
 12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
 13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Within their application, the LEA/School will budget funds to the specific sections/costs/activities that relate to the School Improvement Intervention Models the LEA/School is implementing. At the end of the application, a Budget Overview will be completed by the LEA/School for each year of funding. Revisions to this budget will need to be completed each spring based on changes identified by the LEA/School. The LEA/School will also be required to complete periodic expenditure reports throughout the lifecycle of the grant so the WDE can monitor expenditures to ensure that spending stays within the budgeted amount. This process is already in place for other grants that are housed within the WDE GMS.

The areas in which funds will be budgeted are:

- Transformation Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance
- Turnaround Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance
- Restart Model:
 - Partnership with CSO, CMO, or EMO
 - Review Process
- School Closure Model:
 - Closure
 - Transferring of Students
 - Civil Rights Considerations

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

This is embedded within the LEA application within the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process. There are only four School Intervention Models a School/LEA can select and those are consistent with the final regulations. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers – these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination

Team, and Outside Experts. This will ensure a thorough review of the grant and adherence to the final requirements.

LEAs that do not fully and effectively describe their interventions will not be considered for funding because this is such a major component of the final requirements. Subsequently, this will be reviewed annually at the end of each school year when the LEA/School updates their application during the Grant Renewal process. Changes to the existing interventions will be reviewed for consistency with the final requirements - changes not consistent the final requirements will not be accepted.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

This is embedded within the application as part of the first section (Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators) of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding. Regardless of the model chosen by the School/LEA, WDE has hired and assigned a district coach as an external provider to every LEA with schools on the PLA list. This is part of the WDE State System of Support.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

This is embedded within the application as the Additional Resources section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this is not in place within the LEA/School grant, the scoring on their rubric will be affected.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

This is embedded within the application as part of the questions contained at the end of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place and the LEA/School has selected the Restart, Transformation or Turnaround Models, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This has not been included within the application and will have to be reviewed as the grant cycle comes to an end. During the year before the grant ends, in the 2011-2012 grant year, the LEA/School will have to plan for a funding or impact study to determine how the LEA/School will sustain the reform efforts once funding ends at the end of the 2012-2013 school year. The funding or impact study must be completed by the LEA/School before the end of the 2012-2013 school year. This data/analysis will be incorporated into the application at a later date so the information can be uploaded directly into the grant.

--

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation prior to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

Embedded within the application is a section where the LEA reports the Pre-Implementation Activities it is planning and the estimated cost of those activities for the School Intervention Model chosen. Within their application, the LEA/School will budget funds to the specific sections/costs/activities that relate to the Pre-Implementation of the School Improvement Intervention Models the LEA/School is implementing.

The SEA will review these activities and the budget for these activities as part of the Grant Reading and Scoring process to ensure that they cover full and effective implementation of the pre-implementation activities. Grant Readers will ensure that the budget for these activities are necessary and reasonable according to the needs assessment and the School Intervention Model chosen.

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

Housed within the WDE GMS system is the ability to specify the allowable pre-implementation activities. When completing the application, the LEA/School will be asked to select which pre-implementation activities they plan to use. For each pre-implementation activity selected, a

dialog box will appear that will prompt the LEA/School to describe the activity they have selected.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

It is up to the LEA/School to provide the data and evidence to support their claim that it does not have enough capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. Data for support should be, but not limited to:

Restart:

- Data to support the lack of CSO, CMO, or EMOs available to their area.

Closure:

- Data to support that an LEA does not have a sufficient number of schools to facilitate the closure of a school

Transformation:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Turnaround:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Other data should include specific challenges or circumstances that pertain to the LEA, size, location, number of schools, number of schools in improvement status, and number of schools identified in Tier I, II, and III.

This data will be reviewed by a review panel within the WDE comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and Outside Experts. Upon review, the panel will make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who will make the final decision as to whether or not the LEA has shown that they do not have sufficient capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. If it is determined that the LEA/School has sufficient capacity, then the SEA will go back to the LEA to discuss capacity issues. The LEA will then choose whether or not to continue the application including the Tier I school.

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Section D (Part 1) Timeline: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

The 1003 g School Improvement Funds application will be housed within the WDE's GMS so the application will be electronic. Qualifying LEA/Schools will be able to create, complete, and submit their application on-line. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers – these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and WDE LEA Coaches. Each reader will complete an on-line rubric for each grant. Scores will be compiled, evaluated, and ranked. Grant awards will be determined based on scores and availability of funds. Timeline is as follows:

- March, 2011 – during Title I Director video conferencing meetings, the requirements for the grant will be discussed and questions will be answered (Completed)
- March, 2011 – LEAs evaluate schools to determine if they can and should apply for 1003(g) funds
- June 1, 2011 – Letter of intent to apply for 1003(g) funds due to the WDE
- June 6, 2011 – application will be on-line for LEA/Schools to complete; video conference with all qualifying LEA/Schools to go over application and answer questions
- July 6 , 2011 – deadline for application submission
- July 8, 2011 – Grant Reader training
- July 11-15, 2011 – review and clarifications of grants by a team of Grant Readers
- August 1, 2011 – LEA/Schools will be notified of grant approval.
- August 10, 2011 – schools will get their Grant Award Notification; LEA/Schools can begin pre-implementation activities and encumber and draw down pre-implementation funds immediately.
- Fall, School Year 2011-2012 Districts implement the reform model
- Fall, School Year 2011–2012 LEA/Schools will be able to draw down and use funds.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.³

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

☐ SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information:

(2) *Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final*

requirements.

The Goals will be measured by the data that the LEA/school selects to demonstrate progress in student achievement as a summative measure. A second measure is selected as a progress measure so that teachers can also use formative assessments. LEAs will be required to revise and update their grant application each year by June 30 during the Grant Renewal. At that time, the LEA/School will update the current application, strategies, timelines, and budgets. The LEA/School will also be required to upload data and analysis to support whether or not the school has met their goals and/or making progress on their leading indicators. A section will also be built into the application to capture and report required data for the USED as outlined by the final requirements.

Because PAWS data is not available until July, the LEA will be required to select an additional indicator to measure student achievement. This data should be from a source that is available so the LEA can submit that data by June 30. LEAs will be asked to submit PAWS data and analysis by October 1.

If the LEA has not completed the necessary updates, data reviews, and reporting, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds from this grant until those requirements have been met. Likewise, if PAWS data has not been uploaded and analyzed by October 1, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds until that data has been submitted.

Data will be reviewed by an independent reviewer hired by the WDE and evaluated as to whether or not the school has met their goals and/or is making progress on their leading indicators. Initial approval to continue with the grant will be given by the reviewer, with the assumption that PAWS data will be uploaded by October 1. The reviewer also can request any clarifications on the data submitted at this time. Upon review of all the data, the reviewer will report their findings to the WDE and give a recommendation as to whether to renew the grant, give conditional approval for an additional year based on meeting goals and/or making progress, or cancel the grant based on the LEA/School not meeting their goals and making progress, or for not fully and efficiently implementing the grant as is written. The recommendation of the evaluator will be reviewed by the District Coach, the WDE School Improvement Team, and the WDE Title I staff. This group will decide whether to continue funding or not.

If funding continues, the continuing application will reflect whether or not the goal has been met and may impact the level of funding in the second and third year as awarded by the continuing application.

If the goal is not met, the Evaluator will work with the District Coach, the WDE School Improvement Team to provide technical assistance to include interventions in the continuing application that address the reason for not meeting the goal.

(3) *Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.*

This process will be the same as for Tier I and Tier II schools. Please see D (2)

(4) *Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.*

Starting September, 2011, an independent reviewer hired by the WDE will go to each school to review the implementation of the Schools Intervention Model. This reviewer will provide periodic reports to the WDE as to the implementation and progress of each school. Reviews will be conducted at least once per semester during each school year, with more if it is determined, through the reviewer's evaluation, that the school is not successfully implementing the School Intervention Model selected. A rubric has been developed by the independent reviewer and will be used to evaluate this implementation, for all schools beginning the 2011-2012 school year.

(5) *Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.*

Priority funding will be given first to Tier I schools and then to Tier II schools. If further priority ranking is still needed, priority will be given to those schools that were identified for Tier I or Tier II based on their graduation rates. If further prioritization is needed, it will be based on the PLA ranking of the schools within each Tiered list. Each Tier has already been priority ranked, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list – Appendix B.

(6) *Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.*

Priority funding will first be given to Tier III schools who are fully implementing all the required activities for one of the School Intervention Models as outlined by the final requirements. After that, priority will be given to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that were not identified in Tier I. Lastly, priority will be based on the PLA ranking of the remaining Title I and Title I eligible schools within the Tier III list. Priority has already been assigned to these schools, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list – Appendix B.

(7) *If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and*

indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

This is not an option Wyoming's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Cindy Hill, chooses to exercise – the WDE does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) *If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.*

This is not applicable at this time; please see statement in area D (7).

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ☒ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ☒ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

Section F SEA Reservation:

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The WDE will use the 5% set-aside of the School Improvement funds for the cost of developing, implementing, and maintain the 1003 g School Improvement Grant on the WDE GMS. Funds will also be used to hire an independent reviewer/evaluator to monitor and evaluate the implementation of these grants and report to progress, or lack of it, to the WDE. The remainder of the funds will be used for in-state travel expenses related to stakeholder meetings, as well as out-of –state travel to meetings, symposiums, and conferences related to School Improvement and these funds.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

☒ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

☒ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including internal stakeholders, administrators from LEAs that will be receiving these funds, and RMC Research/NWRCC

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier

III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** .

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

☐ Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

☒ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

☒ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

☒ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

☒ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” [‡]	Title I eligible [§] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ^{**}	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years.

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

[§] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

^{**} Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Wyoming



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@ed.gov

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at carlas.mccauley@ed.gov.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application

remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Name: David Holbrook

Position and Office: Supervisor, Federal Programs Division

Contact's Mailing Address:
2300 Capitol Avenue,
Hathaway Building, 1st Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050

Telephone: (307) 777-6260

Fax: (307) 777-7633

Email address: dholbr@educ.state.wy.us

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):
Cindy Hill, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Telephone:
(307) 777-7675

Signature of the Chief State School Officer:

X

Date:

The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.		
SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition</p>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

☐ Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

☒ Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:

For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:

☐ 1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier

☐ 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has

I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

☐ SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)

☐ 2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

☒ 3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

Defining and Identifying Wyoming’s Tier I, II and III Schools

In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting persistently lowest-achieving schools, Wyoming has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding.

In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools, the basis for the identification of those schools is as follows:

Identifying Tier I Schools

Tier I schools consist of the following:

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

1. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective

- action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
- 2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier II Schools

Tier II schools consist of the following:

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

- 1. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
- 2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier III Schools

Tier III schools consist of the following:

Is any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; or

- 1. Is a Title I eligible school among the lowest quintile (20%) of performance based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; and
- 2. Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

Ranking of Schools Methodology

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools’ Academic Achievement (performance) on PAWS (Wyoming’s state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 1. **Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade:** The statewide percentage of students testing proficient in each grade. All students tested in Wyoming public schools are included.
- 2. **Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient:** As testing for each grade level is independent of testing at other grade levels, the enrollment-by-grade makeup of each school must be taken into account to create a performance measure that will be valid for performance comparison of all Wyoming schools. To accomplish this need, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values for each grade served by a school are averaged, weighted by the percentage of students enrolled in each grade served.
 - a. Examples:
 - i. Suppose that Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade is 50% for fourth grade and

60% for fifth grade.

- ii. Example 1: A school serves only the fourth and fifth grades with enrollment of 50 fourth grade students and 50 fifth grade students.

- 1. Half (50%) the students are enrolled in fourth grade, and half are enrolled in fifth grade.
- 2. With equal enrollment weighting (half the 100 total students are in each grade), the weighted average target likewise becomes the halfway point between the fourth grade and fifth grade Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values (50% and 60%, respectively). This halfway point, the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient, is then 55%.
 - a. Mathematically, this 55% weighted average is calculated as [(50 fourth grade students * 50% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade) + (50 fifth grade students * 60% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fifth grade)] divided by 100 students total enrolled in the school.

- iii. Example 2: A school serves only the fourth grade, with a total enrollment of 100 fourth grade students.

- 1. With all 100 students enrolled in fourth grade, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade of 50% becomes the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient for the school.

- 3. **Relative Proficiency Performance:** The comparative final metric, this is the difference between the percent of students proficient in a school and the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient applicable to the school's particular enrollment-by-grade makeup.

- a. Relative Proficiency Performance values are calculated as positive or negative percentages. The higher a positive percentage, the better a school's performance on current year testing. The lower a negative percentage, the more a school is in need of improvement.
- b. Relative Proficiency Performance values are then ranked. The higher the percentage, the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the percentage, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' Progress in performance on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 1. As described within Wyoming's Academic Achievement metric overview, the Relative

Proficiency Performance values are calculated by subject and school year for each Wyoming school.

2. **Performance Trend Value:** A three year performance trend value (linear regression slope) is then calculated for each school.
 - a. A positive Performance Trend Values indicates that a school has a positive three year performance trend (performance is increasing). Likewise, a negative value indicates a decreasing performance trend. The higher the Performance Trend Value, the larger the relative three year performance gain trend, and vice-versa.
 - b. Performance Trend Value figures are then ranked. The higher the figure the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the figure, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Overall ranking of schools then takes place as follows:

1. **School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking:** The average of the four calculated Academic Achievement and Progress rankings:
 - a. Math Academic Achievement Ranking
 - b. Reading Academic Achievement Ranking
 - c. Math Progress Ranking
 - d. Reading Progress Ranking
2. Methodology remains the same across the four component rankings and the final School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking in that the higher the ranking, the lower the performance and the greater the need for improvement.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

☐ **SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Part 1

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.*

Embedded within the application are the questions the LEA will need to answer to show that they have analyzed the needs of their school, what School Intervention Model they have chosen, and why they chose that model.

In determining their needs, the LEA should review the school's NCA Profile, analyze the school's PAWS data, and data from one other rigorous district-based assessment commonly used within that district. The LEA should also go through the questions contained in B (2) and answer them to help determine what School Intervention Model is best suited for the needs of the school. This comprehensive needs assessment should be done through their School Improvement Team which is comprised of school leadership, teachers, and parents – additional members from the LEA Senior Leadership Team should be added in not already in place.

The WDE will provide technical assistance as needed through its SSoS.

- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.*

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School (Wyoming has some small rural LEAs that have a composition of one K-12 school, in these LEAs, the LEA is the school, hence the use of LEA/School throughout this application) will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the following questions concerning the model they wish to implement. Technical assistance by the WDE SSoS will be provided to LEA/Schools to help with the needs assessment to determine if a school can implement a School Intervention Model.

The Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that

- is necessary?
8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
 9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
 10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Restart Model

1. Are there qualified CSO, CMO, or EMOs willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

The Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

(3) *The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).*

Within their application, the LEA/School will budget funds to the specific sections/costs/activities that relate to the School Improvement Intervention Models the LEA/School is implementing. At the end of the application, a Budget Overview will be completed by the LEA/School for each year of funding. Revisions to this budget will need to be completed each spring based on changes identified by the LEA/School. The LEA/School will also be required to complete periodic expenditure reports throughout the lifecycle of the grant so the WDE can monitor expenditures to ensure that spending stays within the budgeted amount. This process is already in place for other grants that are housed within the WDE GMS.

The areas in which funds will be budgeted are:

- Transformation Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance

- Turnaround Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance
- Restart Model:
 - Partnership with CSO, CMO, or EMO
 - Review Process
- School Closure Model:
 - Closure
 - Transferring of Students
 - Civil Rights Considerations

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

This is embedded within the LEA application within the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process. There are only four School Intervention Models a School/LEA can select and those are consistent with the final regulations. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers – these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and Outside Experts. This will ensure a thorough review of the grant and adherence to the final requirements.

LEAs that do not fully and effectively describe their interventions will not be considered for funding because this is such a major component of the final requirements. Subsequently, this will be reviewed annually at the end of each school year when the LEA/School updates their application during the Grant Renewal process. Changes to the existing interventions will be reviewed for consistency with the final requirements - changes not consistent the final requirements will not be accepted.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

This is embedded within the application as part of the first section (Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators) of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding. Regardless of the model chosen by the School/LEA, WDE has hired and

assigned a district coach as an external provider to every LEA with schools on the PLA list. This is part of the WDE State System of Support.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

This is embedded within the application as the Additional Resources section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this is not in place within the LEA/School grant, the scoring on their rubric will be affected.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

This is embedded within the application as part of the questions contained at the end of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place and the LEA/School has selected the Restart, Transformation or Turnaround Models, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This has not been included within the application and will have to be reviewed as the grant cycle comes to an end. During the year before the grant ends, in the 2011-2012 grant year, the LEA/School will have to plan for a funding or impact study to determine how the LEA/School will sustain the reform efforts once funding ends at the end of the 2012-2013 school year. The funding or impact study must be completed by the LEA/School before the end of the 2012-2013 school year. This data/analysis will be incorporated into the application at a later date so the information can be uploaded directly into the grant.

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation prior to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

Embedded within the application is a section where the LEA reports the Pre-Implementation Activities it is planning and the estimated cost of those activities for the School Intervention Model chosen. Within their application, the LEA/School will budget funds to the specific sections/costs/activities that relate to the Pre-Implementation of the School Improvement Intervention Models the LEA/School is implementing.

The SEA will review these activities and the budget for these activities as part of the Grant Reading and Scoring process to ensure that they cover full and effective implementation of the pre-implementation activities. Grant Readers will ensure that the budget for these activities are necessary and reasonable according to the needs assessment and the School Intervention Model chosen.

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

Housed within the WDE GMS system is the ability to specify the allowable pre-implementation activities. When completing the application, the LEA/School will be asked to select which pre-implementation activities they plan to use. For each pre-implementation activity selected, a dialog box will appear that will prompt the LEA/School to describe the activity they have selected.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

☐ SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

It is up to the LEA/School to provide the data and evidence to support their claim that it does not have enough capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. Data for support should be, but not limited to:

Restart:

- Data to support the lack of CSO, CMO, or EMOs available to their area.

Closure:

- Data to support that an LEA does not have a sufficient number of schools to facilitate the closure of a school

Transformation:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Turnaround:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Other data should include specific challenges or circumstances that pertain to the LEA, size,

location, number of schools, number of schools in improvement status, and number of schools identified in Tier I, II, and III.

This data will be reviewed by a review panel within the WDE comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and Outside Experts. Upon review, the panel will make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who will make the final decision as to whether or not the LEA has shown that they do not have sufficient capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. If it is determined that the LEA/School has sufficient capacity, then the SEA will go back to the LEA to discuss capacity issues. The LEA will then choose whether or not to continue the application including the Tier I school.

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Section D (Part 1) Timeline: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

The 1003 g School Improvement Funds application will be housed within the WDE's GMS so the application will be electronic. Qualifying LEA/Schools will be able to create, complete, and submit their application on-line. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers – these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and WDE LEA Coaches. Each reader will complete an on-line rubric for each grant. Scores will be compiled, evaluated, and ranked. Grant awards will be determined based on scores and availability of funds. Timeline is as follows:

- March, 2011 – during Title I Director video conferencing meetings, the requirements for the grant will be discussed and questions will be answered (Completed)
- March, 2011 – LEAs evaluate schools to determine if they can and should apply for 1003(g) funds
- June 1, 2011 – Letter of intent to apply for 1003(g) funds due to the WDE
- June 6, 2011 – application will be on-line for LEA/Schools to complete; video conference with all qualifying LEA/Schools to go over application and answer questions
- July 6, 2011 – deadline for application submission
- July 8, 2011 – Grant Reader training
- July 11-15, 2011 – review and clarifications of grants by a team of Grant Readers
- August 1, 2011 – LEA/Schools will be notified of grant approval.
- August 10, 2011 – schools will get their Grant Award Notification; LEA/Schools can begin pre-implementation activities and encumber and draw down pre-implementation funds immediately.
- Fall, School Year 2011-2012 Districts implement the reform model
- Fall, School Year 2011–2012 LEA/Schools will be able to draw down and use funds.

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.³

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

☐ SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

☒ SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information:

- i. *Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.*

The Goals will be measured by the data that the LEA/school selects to demonstrate progress in student achievement as a summative measure. A second measure is selected as a progress measure so that teachers can also use formative assessments. LEAs will be required to revise

and update their grant application each year by June 30 during the Grant Renewal. At that time, the LEA/School will update the current application, strategies, timelines, and budgets. The LEA/School will also be required to upload data and analysis to support whether or not the school has met their goals and/or making progress on their leading indicators. A section will also be built into the application to capture and report required data for the USED as outlined by the final requirements.

Because PAWS data is not available until July, the LEA will be required to select an additional indicator to measure student achievement. This data should be from a source that is available so the LEA can submit that data by June 30. LEAs will be asked to submit PAWS data and analysis by October 1.

If the LEA has not completed the necessary updates, data reviews, and reporting, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds from this grant until those requirements have been met. Likewise, if PAWS data has not been uploaded and analyzed by October 1, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds until that data has been submitted.

Data will be reviewed by an independent reviewer hired by the WDE and evaluated as to whether or not the school has met their goals and/or is making progress on their leading indicators. Initial approval to continue with the grant will be given by the reviewer, with the assumption that PAWS data will be uploaded by October 1. The reviewer also can request any clarifications on the data submitted at this time. Upon review of all the data, the reviewer will report their findings to the WDE and give a recommendation as to whether to renew the grant, give conditional approval for an additional year based on meeting goals and/or making progress, or cancel the grant based on the LEA/School not meeting their goals and making progress, or for not fully and efficiently implementing the grant as is written. The recommendation of the evaluator will be reviewed by the District Coach, the WDE School Improvement Team, and the WDE Title I staff. This group will decide whether to continue funding or not.

If funding continues, the continuing application will reflect whether or not the goal has been met and may impact the level of funding in the second and third year as awarded by the continuing application.

If the goal is not met, the Evaluator will work with the District Coach, the WDE School Improvement Team to provide technical assistance to include interventions in the continuing application that address the reason for not meeting the goal.

- ii. Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.*

This process will be the same as for Tier I and Tier II schools. Please see D (2)

- iii. *Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.*

Starting September, 2011, an independent reviewer hired by the WDE will go to each school to review the implementation of the Schools Intervention Model. This reviewer will provide periodic reports to the WDE as to the implementation and progress of each school. Reviews will be conducted at least once per semester during each school year, with more if it is determined, through the reviewer's evaluation, that the school is not successfully implementing the School Intervention Model selected. A rubric has been developed by the independent reviewer and will be used to evaluate this implementation, for all schools beginning the 2011-2012 school year.

- iv. *Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.*

Priority funding will be given first to Tier I schools and then to Tier II schools. If further priority ranking is still needed, priority will be given to those schools that were identified for Tier I or Tier II based on their graduation rates. If further prioritization is needed, it will be based on the PLA ranking of the schools within each Tiered list. Each Tier has already been priority ranked, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list – Appendix B.

- v. *Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.*

Priority funding will first be given to Tier III schools who are fully implementing all the required activities for one of the School Intervention Models as outlined by the final requirements. After that, priority will be given to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that were not identified in Tier I. Lastly, priority will be based on the PLA ranking of the remaining Title I and Title I eligible schools within the Tier III list. Priority has already been assigned to these schools, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list – Appendix B.

- vi. *If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.*

This is not an option Wyoming's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Cindy Hill, chooses to exercise – the WDE does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

- vii. *If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify*

those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

This is not applicable at this time; please see statement in area D (7).

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ☒ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ☒ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

Section F SEA Reservation:

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The WDE will use the 5% set-aside of the School Improvement funds for the cost of developing, implementing, and maintain the 1003 g School Improvement Grant on the WDE GMS. Funds will also be used to hire an independent reviewer/evaluator to monitor and evaluate the implementation of these grants and report to progress, or lack of it, to the WDE. The remainder of the funds will be used for in-state travel expenses related to stakeholder meetings, as well as out-of –state travel to meetings, symposiums, and conferences related to School Improvement and these funds.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

☒ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

☒ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including internal stakeholders, administrators from LEAs that will be receiving these funds, and RMC Research/NWRCC

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

☐ In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** .

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

☐ Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

☐ The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

☒ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot

request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

☒ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

☒ The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

☒ The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

☒ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

☒ The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III

school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

--

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of

\$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.

2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school

improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.

7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.
3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” ²	Title I eligible ³ elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ⁴	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years.

Waiver Request Documentation and Comments

Email sent to all Title I Directors and Committee of Practitioners

Good afternoon all,

² “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

³ For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

⁴ Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

The Wyoming Department of Education is in the process of completing the 2011-2013 School Improvement Grant Section 1003(g) application with the US Department of Education. As part of this application process the WDE can request to waive certain requirements associated with these funds. The WDE has submitted the waiver requests in the previous year's grant however in order to remain in compliance we must notify and provide time for comments to our stakeholders.

The waivers the WDE will be requesting are as follows:

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The section of the application detailing the waiver requests is attached to this email. We ask that you please review and send any comments to Clementina Jimenez at cjimen@educ.state.wy.us. Comments will be accepted beginning January 21, 2011 until February 20, 2011.

We appreciate your time and assistance with this review. Should you have any questions regarding these waiver request please don't hesitate to contact us.

Thank you,

Clementina Jimenez
Wyoming Department of Education
Title I Program Manager
2300 Capitol Avenue
1st Floor Hathaway Building
Cheyenne WY 82002
Office: 307-777-5792
Cell: 307-286-1305
cjimen@educ.state.wy.us

Public Comment on the Wyoming Department of Education's Waiver Request:

I have reviewed the waiver requests and fully support them.
Sincerely,

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Suzanne Martin

I fully support the requested waivers, especially the 40% poverty rule. Wyoming is such a small state, population wise, that just a couple of kids can change the percentage in many of our schools. It ends up on Title one year then off the next, which makes it impossible to provide a coherent program for Title I students. Brent

I have read the request and do not have any comments other than it looks good. We do not qualify for these so I guess I can't say much. I hope we get our Title I expenditures down so we are below the 15% carry over or I could be in trouble.

Thanks

R. J. Kost

Park County School District #1

Powell, Wyoming 82435

Office: 307-764-6186

E-Mail: rjk@pcsdi.net

All public comment was compiled by Clementina Jimenez, Wyoming State Title I Director

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**



Wyoming Department of Education

***Title I 1003 g
School Improvement Funds***

GRANT APPLICATION PACKET

for

2011-2014

Due April 20, 2011

**Wyoming Department of Education
Federal Programs Unit
2300 Capitol Avenue
Hathaway Building, 1st Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050**

The Wyoming Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in its educational programs. Inquiries concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, and the Americans With Disabilities Act may be referred to the Wyoming Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights Coordinator, 2nd floor, Hathaway Building, Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050 or (307) 777-5329, or the Office for Civil

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Rights, Region VII, US Department of Education, Federal Building, Suite 310, 1244 Speer Blvd., Denver, CO 80204-3582, or (303) 844-3417. This publication will be provided in an alternative form upon request.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

GRANT GUIDELINES

PURPOSE

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010 (final requirements, attached as Appendix C), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools (attached as Appendix A) that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS AND CRITERIA FOR FUNDING

Eligibility for these funds will be based on the Tiered list developed from the WDE's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools definition. That list is housed on the WDE website and attached as Appendix C to this application.

The criteria is defined under the WDE's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools definition, see Appendix A for that definition.

SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS

As stated in the purpose of this grant, Tier I and II schools must implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of one (1) of the following USED School Intervention Models:

- **Closure Model** - Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.
- **Restart Model** - Convert a school or close and reopen it under a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- **Transformation Model** - Implement each of the following strategies: (1) replace the principal and take steps to increase teacher and school leader effectiveness; (2) institute comprehensive instructional reforms; (3) increase learning time and create community-oriented schools; and (4) provide operational flexibility and sustained support.
- **Turnaround Model** - Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the staff, and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student outcomes.

The definition and requirements are further defined in the attached final requirements (Appendix C) under section I, A, 2

Tier III schools are also required to select one of these intervention models, but may modify the requirements to suit the needs of the schools. If modified, the LEA/School will need to describe the modifications and the reasoning behind the changes.

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the questions found in Appendix D of this application.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES AND SUBMISSION

- A separate grant application must be submitted by the district for each school applying for Title I 1003 g School Improvement Funds.
- A comprehensive needs assessment must be conducted by the LEA/School applying for this grant. All data utilized will need to be submitted and in a format that is readable and understandable by WDE Grant Reviewers. Data should be submitted in easy to read tables, either in Word or Excel. Narratives explaining the data and the conclusions reached. If possible, charts and graphs should be used.
- All sections must be completed – only exception is that an LEA/School will only need to fill out the Intervention/Action Plan for the School Intervention Model the LEA/School has selected.
- **Deadline for submission will be 12:00 am (midnight) M.S.T., July 6, 2011. This application will be submitted electronically via the WDE Grants Management System (GMS). Please contact the GMS Coordinator, Randal Butt, at 307-777-8739 to request access and establish a log in for this grant application.**
- Please direct questions concerning this grant to:
 - David Holbrook,
Wyoming Department of Education, Federal Programs Unit
2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 1st Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050
 - 307-777-6260
 - dholbr@educ.state.wy.us

REVIEW CRITERIA

Please see Appendix E for the rubric used for the evaluation of this grant.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

SELECTION PROCESS

A review panel comprised of WDE staff will review all applications to verify that all required items are addressed and that the requested allocation is appropriate. WDE will make the final decisions concerning appropriate expenditures and budgets. Please note that submission of a grant application is not a guarantee that an LEA will receive a grant award.

PRIORITIZATION

Submission of a grant is not a guarantee that a LEA will receive a grant – funding is limited and the amounts LEAs may request per year are significant, so the WDE may have to prioritize what grants get funded.

Priority funding will be given first to Tier I schools and then to Tier II schools. If further priority ranking is still needed, priority will be given to those schools that were identified for Tier I or Tier II based on their graduation rates. If further prioritization is needed, it will be based the ranking of the schools within each Tiered list (Appendix B of this application).

Priority funding will first be given to Tier III schools who are fully implementing all the required activities for one of the School Intervention Models as outline by the final requirements. After that, priority will be given to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that were not identified in Tier I. Lastly, priority will be based on the ranking of the remaining Title I and Title I eligible schools within the Tier III list (Appendix B of this application).

PROJECT PERIOD/AWARD OF GRANTS

The Title I School Improvement grants will be awarded for a period of approximately three (3) years and two (2) months starting on August 10, 2011 and ending June 30, 2014 (assuming the USED approves the waiver request to extend the period of availability of these funds beyond September 30, 2011). An extension to September 30, 2014 may be requested during the last year of the grant period, but a detailed reasoning must be given as to why these funds should be extended to that date. All funds must be drawn. If any funds are not encumbered by June 30, 2014, the LEA will revert any unencumbered funds to the WDE for reallocation unless the LEA has requested an extension to September 30, 2014. All encumbered funds must be drawn down and spent by December 31, 2014.

Since the grant will be awarded August 1, 2011, the time period from the grant award up to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year may include a pre-implementation phase to ensure full implementation of the School Intervention Model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year.

Grant amounts will not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (SUPPLEMENT-NOT SUPPLANT)

Because these School Improvement funds will be used as a Schoolwide Title I program, the participating school is not required to select and provide supplemental services to specific children identified as in need of

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

services. A school operating a schoolwide program does not have to: (1) show that Federal funds used with the school are paying for additional services that would not otherwise be provided; (2) demonstrate that Federal funds are used only for specific target populations; or (3) separately track Federal program funds once they reach the school. A schoolwide program school, however, must use Title I funds only to supplement the amount of funds that would, in the absence of the Title I funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for that school, including funds needed to provide services that are required by law for children with disabilities and children with limited English proficiency. [Section1114(a)(2)]

EVALUATION

LEAs will be required to revise and update their grant application each year by June 30 during the Grant Renewal. At that time, the LEA/School will update the current application, strategies, timelines, and budgets. The LEA/School will also be required to upload data and analysis to support whether or not the school has met their goals and/or making progress on their leading indicators. A section will also be built into the application to capture and report required data for the USED as outlined by the final requirements (see Appendix C of this application).

Because PAWS data is not available until July, the LEA will be required to select an additional indicator to measure student achievement. This data should be from a source that is available so the LEA can submit that data by June 30. LEAs will be asked to submit PAWS data and analysis by October 1.

If the LEA has not completed the necessary updates, data reviews, and reporting, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds from this grant until those requirements have been met. Likewise, if PAWS data has not been uploaded and analyzed by October 1, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds until that data has been submitted.

Data will be reviewed by an independent reviewer hired by the WDE and evaluated as to whether or not the school has met their goals and/or is making progress on their leading indicators. Initial approval to continue with the grant will be given by the reviewer, with the assumption that PAWS data will be uploaded by October 1. The reviewer also can request any clarifications on the data submitted at this time. Upon review of all the data, the reviewer will report their findings to the WDE and give a recommendation as to whether to renew the grant, give conditional approval for an additional year based on meeting goals and/or making progress, or cancel the grant based on the LEA/School not meeting their goals and making progress, or for not fully and efficiently implementing the grant as is written.

WDE Approval/Date	Total Amount Awarded \$
--------------------------	--

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA and SCHOOL INFORMATION

A. LEA Information

LEA Name and NCES ID Number:	
Name and Title of LEA Contact for Grant Application:	
Address:	Telephone Number:
City:	Zip:
Email Address:	
<i>Authorized District Signature (Superintendent or Designee)</i>	Date

B. School Information

School Name and NCES ID Number:					
Name of School Principal:					
Address:				Telephone Number:	
City:				Zip:	
Email Address:					
Grade Span:		Poverty Rate:		Current Graduation Rate:	
Check All That Apply:	Title I Status:				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide School		<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance School		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Eligible School <i>(please describe how you are eligible)</i>				
	School Improvement Status:				
	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A – Made AYP	<input type="checkbox"/> Warning Year	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 2	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Year 6 - Higher	
	Tier:				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tier I	<input type="checkbox"/> Tier II	<input type="checkbox"/> Tier III	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Intervention Selected (Required for Tier I or II, Optional for Tier III):				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Closure	<input type="checkbox"/> Restart	<input type="checkbox"/> Transformation	<input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround	
<i>Building Principal's Signature</i>				Date	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

ASSURANCES

- ☐ For schools in School Improvement, I hereby certify that this plan was developed with the assistance of a LEA Coach and/or District Support and Coordination Team Member, as applicable, in collaboration with the School Improvement Team.
- ☐ I hereby certify that this plan was designed to improve student achievement with input from all stakeholders.
- ☐ I assure that the school-level personnel, including subgroup representatives responsible for implementation of the interventions outlined in this application, have collaborated in the completion of this application.
- ☐ I hereby certify that this plan has all of the following components:
 - Evidence of the use of a comprehensive needs assessment, which should include all necessary data analysis;
 - An action plan to implement one of the School Intervention Models as outline by the final regulations (Appendix B of this application);
 - Annual goals (implementation indicators);
 - Scientifically based research methods, strategies, and activities that guide curriculum content, instruction, and assessment;
 - Professional Development components aligned with assessed needs and School Intervention Model selected for implementation;
 - Family and community involvement activities aligned with assessed needs and School Intervention Model selected for implementation;
 - Evaluation strategies that include methods to measure progress of implementation;
 - Coordination of fiscal resources and analysis of school budget (possible redirection of funds); and
 - An action plan with timelines and specific activities for implementing the above criteria.
- ☐ I certify that the LEA will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the US Department of Education (USED) final requirements as outlined for 1003 g funds;
- ☐ I certify that the LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students (PAWS) in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the USED final requirements as outlined for 1003 g funds in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds (approved by the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE)) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- ☐ I certify that if the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or educational management organization accountable for complying with the USED final requirements outlined for 1003 g funds;
- ☐ I certify to report to the WDE the school-level data required under section III of the USED final requirements outline for 1003 g funds;
- ☐ I further certify that the information contained in this assurance is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Superintendent's signature

Principal's signature

LEA Coach or District Support and Coordination Team
Member

Chair, School Improvement Team

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

WAIVER REQUEST

The Wyoming Department of Education has requested the below waivers of requirements applicable to the Title I 1003 g School Improvement Application. It is assumed that an LEA completing this application will implement all of the requested waivers. If an LEA does not wish to implement one of these waivers, it must indicate which one of those waivers it does not intend to implement and why.

Please check each waiver that you **do not** wish to implement:

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Please Note: The WDE has requested a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds. If approved, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in Wyoming.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The LEA/School will need to review the following to in order to complete a comprehensive needs assessment. This needs assessment should not only look at the needs of the student, but of staff and the community. Resources and partnerships that can help the LEA/School with their intervention should also be reviewed.

School Data Analysis

PAWS: Language Arts (percentage of students)

Grade	Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
11												

PAWS: Language Arts by Subgroup

Percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Basic (add together)

Grade	White Students			Native American Students			Hispanic Students			Other Ethnic Groups			Low SES			Students with Disabilities			English Language Learners		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
3																					
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
8																					

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

11																						
----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

PAWS: Mathematics (percentage of students)

Grade	Below Basic			Basic			Proficient			Advanced		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
11												

PAWS: Mathematics by Subgroup

Percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Basic (add together)

Grade	White Students			Native American Students			Hispanic Students			Other Ethnic Groups			Low SES			Students with Disabilities			English Language Learners		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
3																					
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
8																					
11																					

Please also provide data for MAP assessment and another rigorous LEA assessment.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Provide a brief description of your school, your attendance area, and your community.	
List your school and LEA mission statement – how do they align?	
Describe how the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted in an inclusive manner so it reaches all members of the school community (including regular education, special education, gifted and talented, migrant, students with limited English proficiency, etc. as well as low-achieving students), paying particular attention to the needs of educationally disadvantaged children.	
Summarize (using data) the actual results of your needs assessment.	
Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the current program for improving the education of low-achieving students.	
Strengths	
Weaknesses	
As a result of the comprehensive needs assessment, what are the specific priority need areas for the school? (Please list in priority order 1, 2, 3, etc.)	
<p>What School Intervention Model will the school implement based on the comprehensive needs assessment? (This should be directly related to the priority need areas listed above)</p> <p>Please explain how the LEA has the capacity to use these School Improvement Funds to provide adequate resources and related support to the school in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected:</p>	
Explain how implementing this model will meet the needs of all the students in your school.	
Please give a summary of input from relevant stakeholder group regarding the selection and implementation of a School Intervention Model (agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets should be available from the LEA for review if needed):	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Additional Resources

Please provide information on any additional funding sources the school may have available that can be use in conjunction with these School Improvement Funds.

Program List/Funding: (including during- and after-school programs)	Currently Using	No. of Years	Proposed Program	Deleted Program
Response to Intervention - IDEA and/or Title I Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Professional Learning Communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bridges Grant (either Extended Day or Year)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-School Program(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title I School Improvement Funds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title I-D, Subpart A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title II-A – Teacher/Leader Quality Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title II-B - Math/Science Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title II-D – Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Title III – Services to English Language Learners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
McKinney-Vento Homeless Grant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GEAR-UP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Click Here to Enter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Click Here to Enter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Click Here to Enter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Click Here to Enter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u> # </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

List Supplemental Educational Services provided for your students (Title I schools in SI 2 and above): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Click Here to Enter
List the Distance Learning (i.e., web-based, satellite) courses provided for your students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Click Here to Enter

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Please provide information on any additional partnerships the school may have available that can be use in conjunction with these School Improvement Funds.

School Partnerships (Type the name of each partner in the space provided)	
University	Enter Partner name
Technical Institute	Enter Partner name
Feeder School(s)	Enter Partner name
Community	Enter Partner name
Business/Industry	Enter Partner name
Private Grants	Enter Partner name
Other	Enter Partner name

Please give a detailed explanation as to how the strategies selected will utilize the existing programs, funding sources, and partnerships listed above:

Will these funding sources and partnerships be available when the funding for this grant has ended?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

CAPACITY

If the LEA has Tier I schools and is applying to serve schools in other Tiers or only one Tier I school, the LEA must explain, in detail, why it lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school.

If an LEA has one or more...	In order to get 1003 g SI Funds, the LEA must commit to serve...
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I Schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II Schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III Schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes
Please give a detailed explanation as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools:	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

INTERVENTIONS / ACTION PLAN – Information Page/No Response Needed

A school in Tier I or Tier II must select one of the school intervention models and implement, fully and effectively, the required activities for that model.

A Tier III school must also select one of the intervention models, but may modify the required activities for that model. Schools in Tier III must give an explanation as to the reasoning to the modification. Priority funding will be given to Tier III schools who fully implement all the required activities for one of the school intervention models.

Please Note: The total LEA budget for each year must be at least \$50,000 and may not exceed \$2,000,000.

Also Note: New to the application this year is a section on Pre-Implementation Activities that can be conducted during the 2010-2011 school year, after the LEA/School has been awarded the grant but prior to the school year in which School Improvement Grant interventions and activities are implemented. Pre-Implementation Activities are those activities that may be necessary to ensure that the LEA/School can implement the school improvement interventions and activities at the beginning of the school year instead of mid-year. Pre-Implementation Activities do not need to be completed before the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year, but the School Improvement Grant interventions and activities must be implemented at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. The following is the guidance from the US Department of Education related to the types of allowable Pre-Implementation Activities:

Taken from Guidance on FY2010 School Improvement Grants -

J-2. What are examples of SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year?

This section of the guidance identifies possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation. The activities noted should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is FY 2010 Guidance implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model (see H- 19a).
- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.
- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools. As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including preimplementation activities. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Closure Model

Implementation Indicator:

Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):

Desired Outcomes (Objectives):

Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Pre-Implementation during 2010-2011 school year (August 10, 2011 to start of 11-12 school year)

Full Implementation must occur in the 2011-2012 school year.

Pre-implementation Phase Activities – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with the planning for closure of the school*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost
					SY 2010 - 2011
Total Cost by Year					

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA-level Activities – please list any and all LEA-level activities/cost associated with implementing the Closure Model							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

Closure – please list any and all activities/cost associated with the closure of the school							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Student Transfer – please list any and all activities/cost associated with the transferring of students							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Civil Rights Considerations – please list any and all activities/cost associated with civil rights							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership – <i>please list any and all activities/cost associated with establishing and maintaining this partnership</i>							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Specific Intervention Questions:

Who will be involved in the pre-implementation phase activities?
What higher achieving school or schools within the LEA will the students from the closed school be attending?
How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?
<p>For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?</p> <p>Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:</p>
Please give a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process the LEA will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO (please take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability):

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Restart Model

Implementation Indicator:

Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):

Desired Outcomes (Objectives):

Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Pre-Implementation during 2010-2011 school year (August 10, 2011 to start of 11-12 school year)

Full Implementation must occur in the 2011-2012 school year.

Pre-Implementation Phase Activities – *please list any and all LEA-level activities/cost associated with planning for implementing the Restart Model*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost
					SY 2010 - 2011
Total Cost by Year					
Total Cost for All Activities by Year					

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with establishing and maintaining this partnership*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Partnership Review Process – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with the transferring of students*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA-level Activities – please list any and all LEA-level activities/cost associated with implementing the Restart Model							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

Specific Intervention Questions:

Who will be involved in the pre-implementation phase activities?

Please give a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process the LEA will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO (please take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability):

How will the school ensure enrollment, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school?

How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?

How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended Incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?

Please provide a timeline for a funding or impact study beginning in the 2011-2012 school year to be completed before the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

How will this intervention change the existing school? What direction will the new school take to change the policies and practices found within the old school?

For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Turnaround Model

Please Note: *if implementing the School Turnaround Model, the LEA/School may also implement any of the required or permissible strategies under the School Transformation Model. If that is being done, please fill out the strategies selected in the School Transformation Model Action Plan.*

Implementation Indicator:

Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):

Desired Outcomes (Objectives):

Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Activities and Action Plan: Pre-Implementation during 2010-2011 school year (August 10, 2011 to start of 11-12 school year)

Full Implementation must occur in the 2011-2012 school year.

Pre-Implementation Phase Activities – please list any and all activities/cost associated with planning for implement of the school turnaround model.

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost
					SY 2010 - 2011
Total Cost by Year					

Teachers and Leaders – please list any and all activities/cost associated with principal replacement, review/select new school staff, and implement of recruitment/placement/retention strategies

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Instructional and Support Strategies – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with the selection/implementation of an student needs based instruction model, providing job-embedded professional development designed to build the capacity/support of school staff, and to ensure continues use of data to inform/differentiate instruction*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Time and Support – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with increased learning time for staff and students, and social-emotional/community-oriented services/support*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Governance – please list any and all activities/cost associated with a new governance structure							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

LEA-level Activities – please list any and LEA-level all activities/cost associated with the Turnaround Model activities							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with establishing and maintaining this partnership*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Specific Intervention Questions:

Who will be involved in the Pre-Implementation phase activities?

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to review and select a new principal and staff for the school (please note, the school may rehire no more than 50% of its existing staff):

What strategies will the LEA/School use to recruit, place and retain staff?

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to select and implement an instructional model based on student needs:

Please give a detailed explanation as to how the LEA/School will evaluate job-embedded professional development to ensure that it is supporting and building the capacity of staff:

How will the school ensure use of data to inform and differentiate instruction?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

How will the school increase learning time for staff and students?

How will the schools governance structure change?

How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?

How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?

Please provide a timeline for a funding or impact study beginning in the 2011-2012 school year to be completed before the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

How will the policies and practices will within the school be modified due to the activities selected in this intervention?

For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

Please give a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process the LEA will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO (please take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability):

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Transformation Model

Implementation Indicator:

Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):

Desired Outcomes (Objectives):

Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Pre-Implementation during 2010-2011 school year (August 10, 2011 to start of 11-12 school year)

Full Implementation must occur in the 2011-2012 school year.

Pre-Implementation Phase Activities – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with planning for implementation of the School Transformation Model*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost
					SY 2010 - 2011
	Total Cost by Year				

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Teachers and Leaders – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with principal replacement, implementation of a new staff evaluation system, indentify/reward staff, and implementation of recruitment/placement/retention strategies*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Instructional and Support Strategies – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with the selection/implementation of an student needs based instruction model, providing job-embedded professional development designed to build the capacity/support of school staff, and to ensure continues use of data to inform/differentiate instruction*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Time and Support – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with increased learning time for staff and students, providing an ongoing mechanism for community/family engagement, and social-emotional/community-oriented services/support*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

Governance – *please list any and all activities/cost associated with providing operating flexibility and to ensure ongoing technical assistance*

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA-level Activities – please list any and all Lea-level activities/cost associated with implementing the Transformation Model							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							
Total Cost for All Activities by Year							

CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership – please list any and all activities/cost associated with establishing and maintaining this partnership							
Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	SY 2013 - 2014
Total Cost by Year							

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Specific Intervention Questions:

Who will be involved in the Pre-implementation activities?

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to review and select a new principal:

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to implement a new evaluation system:

How will the LEA /School ensure that it is developed with input from staff?

How will the LEA/School ensure the use of student growth as significant factor for this new evaluation system?

What strategies will the LEA/School use to recruit, place and retain staff?

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to select and implement an instructional model based on student needs:

Please give a detailed explanation as to how the LEA/School will evaluate job-embedded professional development to ensure that it is supporting and building the capacity of staff:

How will the school ensure use of data to inform and differentiate instruction?

How will the school increase learning time for staff and students?

How will the school ensure ongoing community and family engagement is provided?

How will the LEA ensure sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

How will the LEA ensure on-going technical assistance to this school? What will that technical assistance look like?

How will the LEA grant operating flexibility to the new school leader?

How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?

How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?

Please provide a timeline for a funding or impact study beginning in the 2011-2012 school year to be completed before the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

Please give a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process the LEA will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO (please take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability):

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

BUDGET OVERVIEW (Please Note: The total LEA budget for each year must be at least \$50,000 and may not exceed \$2,000,000.)

School Year 2010-2011 (Pre-Implementation Phase, August 10, 2011 to the Start of 2011-2012 school year)

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
<i>School Closure</i>						
Pre-Implementation						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Restart</i>						
Pre-Implementation						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
<i>School Transformation</i>						
Pre-Implementation						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Turnaround</i>						
Pre-Implementation						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Year 2011-2012 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
<i>School Closure</i>						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Restart</i>						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
<i>School Transformation</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Turnaround</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013 – possible extension to September 30, 2013)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
<i>School Closure</i>						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Restart</i>						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
<i>School Transformation</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Turnaround</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

School Year 2013-2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014 – possible extension to September 30, 2014)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
<i>School Closure</i>						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Restart</i>						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
<i>School Transformation</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
<i>School Turnaround</i>						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Total Estimated Grant Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

REPORTING

For each school receiving 1003 g School Improvement Funds, the LEA will need to send the following data to the WDE (the means for collecting this data has not yet been determined by the WDE):

Metric	Currently Collected	New Requirement
School Data		
LEA Name	X	
NCES ID #	X	
School Name	X	
NCES ID #	X	
Intervention Used		X
Which AYP Targets Met and Missed	X	
School Improvement Status	X	
Number of Minutes within School Year		X
Student Outcome/Academic Progress Data		
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (<u>e.g.</u> , Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup	X	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	X	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup		X
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	X	
Graduation rate	X	
Dropout rate	X	
Student attendance rate	X	
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (<u>e.g.</u> , AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes		X (HS Only)
College enrollment rates		X (HS Only)
Student Connection and School Climate		
Discipline incidents	X	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Truants	X	
Talent		
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system		X
Teacher attendance rate		X

APPENDIX A

Defining and Identifying Wyoming's Tier I, II and III Schools

In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting persistently lowest-achieving schools, Wyoming has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding.

In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools, the basis for the identification of those schools is as follows:

Identifying Tier I Schools

Tier I schools consist of the following:

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

3. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
4. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier II Schools

Tier II schools consist of the following:

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

3. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the “all-students” group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
4. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Identifying Tier III Schools

Tier III schools consist of the following:

Is any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; or

3. Is a Title I eligible school among the lowest quintile (20%) of performance based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; and
4. Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

Ranking of Schools Methodology

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' Academic Achievement (performance) on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

4. **Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade:** The statewide percentage of students testing proficient in each grade. All students tested in Wyoming public schools are included.
5. **Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient:** As testing for each grade level is independent of testing at other grade levels, the enrollment-by-grade makeup of each school must be taken into account to create a performance measure that will be valid for performance comparison of all Wyoming schools. To accomplish this need, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values for each grade served by a school are averaged, weighted by the percentage of students enrolled in each grade served.
 - a. Examples:
 - i. Suppose that Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade is 50% for fourth grade and 60% for fifth grade.
 - ii. Example 1: A school serves only the fourth and fifth grades with enrollment of 50 fourth grade students and 50 fifth grade students.
 1. Half (50%) the students are enrolled in fourth grade, and half are enrolled in fifth grade.
 2. With equal enrollment weighting (half the 100 total students are in each grade), the weighted average target likewise becomes the halfway point between the fourth grade and fifth grade Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade values (50% and 60%, respectively). This halfway point, the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient, is then 55%.
 - a. Mathematically, this 55% weighted average is calculated as [(50 fourth grade students * 50% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade) + (50 fifth grade students * 60% Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fifth grade)] divided by 100 students total enrolled in the school.
 - iii. Example 2: A school serves only the fourth grade, with a total enrollment of 100 fourth grade students.
 1. With all 100 students enrolled in fourth grade, the Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade for fourth grade of 50% becomes the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient for the school.

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014

6. **Relative Proficiency Performance:** The comparative final metric, this is the difference between the percent of students proficient in a school and the Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient applicable to the school's particular enrollment-by-grade makeup.
- a. Relative Proficiency Performance values are calculated as positive or negative percentages. The higher a positive percentage, the better a school's performance on current year testing. The lower a negative percentage, the more a school is in need of improvement.
 - b. Relative Proficiency Performance values are then ranked. The higher the percentage, the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the percentage, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' Progress in performance on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

3. As described within Wyoming's Academic Achievement metric overview, the Relative Proficiency Performance values are calculated by subject and school year for each Wyoming school.
4. **Performance Trend Value:** A three year performance trend value (linear regression slope) is then calculated for each school.
 - a. A positive Performance Trend Values indicates that a school has a positive three year performance trend (performance is increasing). Likewise, a negative value indicates a decreasing performance trend. The higher the Performance Trend Value, the larger the relative three year performance gain trend, and vice-versa.
 - b. Performance Trend Value figures are then ranked. The higher the figure the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the figure, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Overall ranking of schools then takes place as follows:

3. **School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking:** The average of the four calculated Academic Achievement and Progress rankings:
 - a. Math Academic Achievement Ranking
 - b. Reading Academic Achievement Ranking
 - c. Math Progress Ranking
 - d. Reading Progress Ranking
4. Methodology remains the same across the four component rankings and the final School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking in that the higher the ranking, the lower the performance and the greater the need for improvement.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014
APPENDIX B**

Wyoming Schools Eligible for FY2010 SIG Funds							
LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Albany #1	5600730	Whiting High School	00066		X		
Albany #1	5600730	Velma Linford Elementary	00014			X	
Big Horn #3	5603170	Greybull Middle School	00378			X	
Big Horn #4	5601090	Riverside High School	00036			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Rawhide Elementary	00071			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Lakeview Elementary	00070			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Meadowlark Elementary	00069			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Cooperative High	00147	X			
Carbon #1	5601030	Pershing Elementary	00033	X			
Carbon #1	5601030	Mountain View Elementary	00032			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Rawlins Middle School	00028			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Moss Agate Elementary	00130			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Intermediate School	00352			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Primary School	00128			X	
Converse #2	5602150	Glenrock High School	00137		X		
Crook #1	5602370	Hulett School	00407			X	
Fremont #1	5602870	Pathfinder High School	00154	X			
Fremont #1	5602870	North Elementary	00199			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Elementary	00226	X			
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Middle School	00386			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian High School	00441			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	00354	X			
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Elementary	00498			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Middle School	00370			X	
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni High School	00323		X		
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni Junior High School	00510			X	
Fremont #25	5605220	Aspen Park Elementary	00292			X	
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Elementary	00162			X	
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Charter High School	00367	X			X
Johnson #1	5603770	Meadowlark Elementary	00380			X	
Johnson #1	5603770	Buffalo High School	00187			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Cole Elementary	00102			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Johnson Junior High School	00094			X	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Laramie #2	5604120	Burns Elementary	00504			X	
Laramie #2	5604120	Pine Bluffs Jr & Sr High School	00210			X	
Lincoln #1	5604030	Kemmerer Alternative School	00358		X		X
Lincoln #2	5604060	Swift Creek High School	00193		X		X
Natrona #1	5604510	Mountain View Elementary	00248			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Bar Nunn Elementary	00445			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Cottonwood Elementary	00377			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	C Y Junior High School	00232			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Evansville Elementary	00237			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Frontier Middle School	00374			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Middle School	00215			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Elementary	00219			X	
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater High School	00391		X		X
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater Junior High School	00509			X	
Platte #2	5603180	Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	00499			X	
Sheridan #2	5605695	Ft. Mackenzie	00189	X			X
Sublette #9	5601260	Big Piney Elementary	00043			X	
Sublette #9	5601260	La Barge Elementary	00044			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Lincoln Elementary	00299			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Rock Springs East Junior High	00295			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Desert View Elementary	00298			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Westridge Elementary	00422			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Expedition Academy	00164		X		
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Truman Elementary	00425			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Lincoln Middle School	00399			X	
Teton #1	5605830	Summit High School	00512		X		
Teton #1	5605830	Jackson Elementary	00313			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	North Evanston Elementary	00433			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	Aspen Elementary	00462			X	
Uinta #4	5604500	Mountain View Middle School	00388			X	
Weston #1	5604830	Newcastle Middle School	00264			X	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Wyoming Schools Eligible for FY2010 SIG Funds sorted by Tiers							
LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Carbon #1	5601030	Cooperative High	00147	X			
Fremont #1	5602870	Pathfinder High School	00154	X			
Carbon #1	5601030	Pershing Elementary	00033	X			
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	00354	X			
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Elementary	00226	X			
Sheridan #2	5605695	Ft. Mackenzie	00189	X			X
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Charter High School	00367	X			X
Albany #1	5600730	Whiting High School	00066		X		
Teton #1	5605830	Summit High School	00512		X		
Converse #2	5602150	Glenrock High School	00137		X		
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni High School	00323		X		
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Expedition Academy	00164		X		
Lincoln #2	5604060	Swift Creek High School	00193		X		X
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater High School	00391		X		X
Lincoln #1	5604030	Kemmerer Alternative School	00358		X		X
Campbell #1	5601470	Rawhide Elementary	00071			X	
Platte #2	5603180	Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	00499			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Lincoln Elementary	00299			X	
Sublette #9	5601260	Big Piney Elementary	00043			X	
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni Junior High School	00510			X	
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater Junior High School	00509			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Moss Agate Elementary	00130			X	
Fremont #25	5605220	Aspen Park Elementary	00292			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian High School	00441			X	
Johnson #1	5603770	Meadowlark Elementary	00380			X	
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Elementary	00162			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Mountain View Elementary	00032			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Lakeview Elementary	00070			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Rock Springs East Junior High	00295			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Middle School	00215			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Middle School	00386			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Truman Elementary	00425			X	
Big Horn #4	5601090	Riverside High School	00036			X	
Crook #1	5602370	Hulett School	00407			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Mountain View Elementary	00248			X	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Desert View Elementary	00298			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Elementary	00498			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Elementary	00219			X	
Laramie #2	5604120	Burns Elementary	00504			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Middle School	00370			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Bar Nunn Elementary	00445			X	
Big Horn #3	5603170	Greybull Middle School	00378			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Cottonwood Elementary	00377			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	C Y Junior High School	00232			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Meadowlark Elementary	00069			X	
Weston #1	5604830	Newcastle Middle School	00264			X	
Sublette #9	5601260	La Barge Elementary	00044			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Cole Elementary	00102			X	
Laramie #2	5604120	Pine Bluffs Jr & Sr High School	00210			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Evansville Elementary	00237			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Westridge Elementary	00422			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Lincoln Middle School	00399			X	
Johnson #1	5603770	Buffalo High School	00187			X	
Uinta #4	5604500	Mountain View Middle School	00388			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Intermediate School	00352			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Frontier Middle School	00374			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Rawlins Middle School	00028			X	
Fremont #1	5602870	North Elementary	00199			X	
Albany #1	5600730	Velma Linford Elementary	00014			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	North Evanston Elementary	00433			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Johnson Junior High School	00094			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	Aspen Elementary	00462			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Primary School	00128			X	
Teton #1	5605830	Jackson Elementary	00313			X	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

APPENDIX C

Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants, as Amended in January 2010

I. SEA Priorities in Awarding School Improvement Grants:

A. Defining key terms. To award School Improvement Grants to its LEAs, consistent with section 1003(g)(6) of the ESEA, an SEA must define three tiers of schools, in accordance with the requirements in paragraph 1, to enable the SEA to select those LEAs with the greatest need for such funds. From among the LEAs in greatest need, the SEA must select, in accordance with paragraph 2, those LEAs that demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the accountability requirements in this notice. Accordingly, an SEA must use the following definitions to define key terms:

1. Greatest need. An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in at least one of the following tiers:

(a) Tier I schools:

(i) A Tier I school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier I school an elementary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)

(1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or

(2) Is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1)(i) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(b) Tier II schools:

(i) A Tier II school is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds and is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier II school a secondary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)

(1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or

(2) Is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B)

(1) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2)(i) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools;” or

(2) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(c) Tier III schools:

(i) A Tier III school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier III school a school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--
 - (A)
 - (1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two years; or
 - (2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
 - (B) Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.
 - (iii) An SEA may establish additional criteria to use in setting priorities among LEA applications for funding and to encourage LEAs to differentiate among Tier III schools in their use of school improvement funds.
2. **Strongest Commitment.** An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve:
- (a) **Turnaround model:**
 - (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--
 - (i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
 - (ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
 - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - (B) Select new staff;
 - (iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
 - (iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
 - (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
 - (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
 - (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
 - (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
 - (2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as--
 - (i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
 - (ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).
 - (b) **Restart model:** A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

- (c) School closure: School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.
- (d) Transformation model: A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:
 - (1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
 - (1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and
 - (2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
 - (C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
 - (D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
 - (E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.
 - (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness, such as--
 - (A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
 - (B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
 - (C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.
 - (2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
 - (A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
 - (B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
 - (C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
 - (D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
 - (E) In secondary schools--
 - (1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
 - (2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
 - (3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
 - (4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.
- (3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
 - (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--
 - (A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;
 - (B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
 - (C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
 - (D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- (4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
 - (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).
- (ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--
 - (A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
 - (B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

3. Definitions.

Increased learning time means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.⁵

Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State--

- (a)
 - (1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and
 - (2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.
- (b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--
 - (i) The academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

⁵ Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." *Child Development*. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.) <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296>

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (ii) The school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

Student growth means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

4. Evidence of strongest commitment.

- (a) In determining the strength of an LEA's commitment to ensuring that school improvement funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable Tier I and Tier II schools to improve student achievement substantially, an SEA must consider, at a minimum, the extent to which the LEA's application demonstrates that the LEA has taken, or will take, action to--
- (i) Analyze the needs of its schools and select an intervention for each school;
 - (ii) Design and implement interventions consistent with these requirements;
 - (iii) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - (iv) Align other resources with the interventions;
 - (v) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - (vi) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (b) The SEA must consider the LEA's capacity to implement the interventions and may approve the LEA to serve only those Tier I and Tier II schools for which the SEA determines that the LEA can implement fully and effectively one of the interventions.

B. Providing flexibility.

1. An SEA may award school improvement funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete the intervention being implemented in that school.
2. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary of the requirements in section 1116(b) of the ESEA in order to permit a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school implementing an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a) or 2(b) of these requirements in an LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. Even though a school implementing the waiver would no longer be in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, it may receive school improvement funds.
3. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that is ineligible to operate a Title I schoolwide program and is operating a Title I targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program in order to implement an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements.
4. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds beyond September 30, 2011 so as to make those funds available to the SEA and its LEAs for up to three years.
5. If an SEA does not seek a waiver under section I.B.2, 3, or 4, an LEA may seek a waiver.

II. Awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs:

A. LEA requirements.

1. An LEA may apply for a School Improvement Grant if it receives Title I, Part A funds and has one or more schools that qualify under the State's definition of a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school.
2. In its application, in addition to other information that the SEA may require--
 - (a) The LEA must--
 - (i) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve;

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (ii) Identify the intervention it will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
 - (iii) Demonstrate that it has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements;
 - (iv) Provide evidence of its strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;
 - (v) Include a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application; and
 - (vi) Include a budget indicating how it will allocate school improvement funds among the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve.
- (b) If an LEA has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.
- 3. The LEA must serve each Tier I school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity (which may be due, in part, to serving Tier II schools) to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Tier I school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Tier I schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.
- 4. The LEA's budget for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve must be of sufficient size and scope to ensure that the LEA can implement one of the rigorous interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements. The LEA's budget must cover the period of availability of the school improvement funds, taking into account any waivers extending the period of availability received by the SEA or LEA.
- 5. The LEA's budget for each Tier III school it commits to serve must include the services it will provide the school, particularly if the school meets additional criteria established by the SEA.
- 6. An LEA that commits to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds must ensure that each such school it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds.
- 7. An LEA in which one or more Tier I schools are located and that does not apply to serve at least one of these schools may not apply for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.
- 8.
 - (a) To monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives school improvement funds, an LEA must--
 - (i) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and
 - (ii) Measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of these requirements.
 - (b) The LEA must also meet the requirements with respect to adequate yearly progress in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.
- 9. If an LEA implements a restart model, it must hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements.
- B. SEA requirements.
 - 1. To receive a School Improvement Grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department at such time, and containing such information, as the Secretary shall reasonably require.
 - 2.
 - (a) An SEA must review and approve, consistent with these requirements, an application for a School Improvement Grant that it receives from an LEA.
 - (b) Before approving an LEA's application, the SEA must ensure that the application meets these requirements, particularly with respect to--

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014

- (i) Whether the LEA has agreed to implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements in each Tier I and Tier II school included in its application;
 - (ii) The extent to which the LEA's application shows the LEA's strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;
 - (iii) Whether the LEA has the capacity to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application; and
 - (iv) Whether the LEA has submitted a budget that includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school it identifies in its application and whether the budget covers the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waiver extending the period of availability received by either the SEA or the LEA.
- (c) An SEA may, consistent with State law, take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools in order to implement the interventions in these requirements.
- (d) An SEA may not require an LEA to implement a particular model in one or more schools unless the SEA has taken over the LEA or school.
- (e) To the extent that a Tier I or Tier II school implementing a restart model becomes a charter school LEA, an SEA must hold the charter school LEA accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds it accountable, for complying with these requirements.
3. An SEA must post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs, all final LEA applications as well as a summary of those grants that includes the following information:
- (a) Name and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number of each LEA awarded a grant.
 - (b) Amount of each LEA's grant.
 - (c) Name and NCES identification number of each school to be served.
 - (d) Type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
4. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, the SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
5. An SEA must award a School Improvement Grant to an LEA in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and these requirements. The LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve.
6. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allocate to each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school an amount sufficient to enable the school to implement fully and effectively the specified intervention throughout the period of availability, including any extension afforded through a waiver, the SEA may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
7. An SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, prior to awarding funds to its LEAs to serve any Tier III schools. If an SEA has awarded school improvement funds to its LEAs for each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve in accordance with these requirements, the SEA may then, consistent with section II.B.9, award remaining school improvement funds to its LEAs for the Tier III schools that its LEAs commit to serve.
8. In awarding School Improvement Grants, an SEA must apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- 9.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

- (a) If not every Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with these requirements. This requirement does not apply in a State that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all the Tier I schools in the State.
- (b) If each Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA may reserve up to 25 percent of its FY 2009 allocation and award those funds in combination with its FY 2010 funds consistent with these requirements.
- 10. In identifying Tier I and Tier II schools in a State for purposes of allocating funds appropriated for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA for any year subsequent to FY 2009, an SEA must exclude from consideration any school that was previously identified as a Tier I or Tier II school and in which an LEA is implementing one of the four interventions identified in these requirements using funds made available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.
- 11. An SEA that is participating in the “differentiated accountability pilot” must ensure that its LEAs use school improvement funds available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in a Tier I or Tier II school consistent with these requirements.
- 12. Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein and may consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.
- C. Renewal for additional one-year periods.
 - (a) If an SEA or an individual LEA requests and receives a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, an SEA--
 - (i) Must renew the School Improvement Grant for each affected LEA for additional one-year periods commensurate with the period of availability if the LEA demonstrates that its Tier I and Tier II schools are meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 and that its Tier III schools are meeting the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; and
 - (ii) May renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant if the SEA determines that the LEA is making progress toward meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA.
 - (b) If an SEA does not renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant because the LEA’s participating schools are not meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA, the SEA may reallocate those funds to other eligible LEAs, consistent with these requirements.
- D. State reservation for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

An SEA may reserve from the school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in any given year no more than five percent for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. An SEA must describe in its application for a School Improvement Grant how the SEA will use these funds.
- E. A State Whose School Improvement Grant Exceeds the Amount the State May Award to Eligible LEAs.

In some States in which a limited number of Title I schools are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the SEA may be able to make School Improvement Grants, renewable for additional years commensurate with the period of availability of the funds, to each LEA with a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school without using the State’s full allocation under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. An SEA in this situation may reserve no more than five percent of its FY 2009 allocation of school improvement funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses under section 1003(g)(8) of the ESEA. The SEA may retain sufficient school improvement funds to serve, for succeeding years, each Tier I, II, and III school that generates funds for an eligible LEA. The Secretary may reallocate to other States any remaining school improvement funds from States with surplus funds.

III. Reporting and Evaluation:

A. Reporting metrics.

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

2011-2014

To inform and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions identified in these requirements, the Secretary will collect data on the metrics in the following chart. The Department already collects most of these data through EDFacts and will collect data on two metrics through SFSF reporting. Accordingly, an SEA must only report the following new data with respect to school improvement funds:

1. A list of the LEAs, including their NCES identification numbers, that received a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the amount of the grant.
2. For each LEA that received a School Improvement Grant, a list of the schools that were served, their NCES identification numbers, and the amount of funds or value of services each school received.
3. For any Tier I or Tier II school, school-level data on the metrics designated on the following chart as “SIG” (School Improvement Grant):

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
SCHOOL DATA			
Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation)	NEW SIG		
AYP status	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Which AYP targets the school met and missed	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
School improvement status	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Number of minutes within the school year	NEW SIG		✓
STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA			
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	<u>EDFacts</u>		✓
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup	NEW SIG	✓	
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Graduation rate	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Dropout rate	<u>EDFacts</u>		✓
Student attendance rate	<u>EDFacts</u>		✓
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	NEW SIG HS only		✓
College enrollment rates	NEW SFSF Phase II HS only	✓	
STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE			
Discipline incidents	<u>EDFacts</u>		✓

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
Truants	EDFacts		✓
TALENT			
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	NEW SFSF Phase II		✓
Teacher attendance rate	NEW SIG		✓

4. An SEA must report these metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention, if the data are available, to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. With respect to a school that is closed, the SEA need report only the identity of the school and the intervention taken--i.e., school closure.

B. Evaluation.

An LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant must participate in any evaluation of that grant conducted by the Secretary.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

APPENDIX D

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the questions below. These questions are to be used to help the LEA/School determine what School Intervention Model would be best for the school. These questions can also be used to help an LEA determine if they have the capacity to serve one or more Tier I or Tier II schools.

The Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Restart Model

1. Are there qualified CSO, CMO, or EMOs willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

The Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

APPENDIX E

Grant Evaluation Rubric

COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. The school presents data from the listed sources (administrators, teachers, students, and parents).

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The needs are based on data collected from a variety of sources (administrators, teachers, students, and parents) with tables included.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Three of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Two of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - data were collected from a single source, or source information is not presented.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Data are based on an adequate sampling of individuals and groups.

- All sampling parameters must receive an Acceptable rating.
- If a Parent Focus Group is used in place of Parent Questionnaires, as long as this focus group meets the minimal sample size, then the Parent parameter receives a rating of “b”.
- **Sample Frame: Focus Groups – Parents (Table 8)**
 - Minimum: 1 group of 6 participants
 - Maximum: 3 groups of 8 participants (i.e., Grades K-5; Grades 6-8; Grades 9-12)

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The perceptual and observational needs assessment data are used based on an adequate sample of individuals and groups. (See Sampling Parameters for Acceptable values.)			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the sample sizes are acceptable.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - All of the sample sizes are acceptable, except Parent Questionnaires which were replaced with Parent Focus Groups.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point -. Some sample sizes are acceptable.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - No sample size data were evident.
Rationale/Comments:			

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

2011-2014

3. Multiple data sources are present.

- Cognitive Data (Student Performance): PAWS data (see embedded template for this data), MAP data, and data from another rigorous LEA-based assessment are included
 - Preferably, most current detailed data with examination of specific areas of weaknesses and a comparison to previous years' data (example 3 years).
 - Cognitive data may also include:
 - Classroom and Unit Assessment
 - IEP Data Progress Reports
- Attitudinal Data: For an acceptable rating, questionnaires and faculty needs assessment, including summaries, must be presented
- Behavioral Data:
 - A classroom observations summary must be presented for this item to be acceptable.
 - At least one of the following items should be included: summary of attendance, graduation, dropout and/or information on suspensions and expulsions.
- Archival Data: Report cards (Parent and Principal), accountability reports (detailed and Subgroup component).

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The needs assessment must incorporate these four types of data: cognitive (student performance), attitudinal, behavioral, and archival.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Student and school level data are provided from all four of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Student and school level data are provided from three of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Student and school level data are provided from two of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Student and school level data are provided from a single type, or no data are presented.
Rationale/Comments:			

4. Data are accurately interpreted to identify strengths and weaknesses.

- Is the information presented an accurate reflection of the data? Has the school missed pertinent information?
- The STRENGTH should be derived from the strengths in the Accountability Data. Review all summary sheets to determine the strengths.
- The WEAKNESSES should be derived from the weaknesses in the Accountability Data. Analyze the Reports, Summaries, Subgroup Percent Proficient, DRA, DIBELS, PAWS, PAWS Alt MAP, LEA Assessments (DRA, DIBELS, etc...), attendance, graduation and dropout rates to determine the weaknesses.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The needs assessment data are accurately interpreted to identify strengths and weaknesses.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Strengths or weaknesses are not based on an accurate interpretation of the data.
Rationale/Comments:			

5. Contributing factors relate to the strengths and weaknesses.

- The contributing factors must be listed.
- Look for things that are most directly related to student learning and that the school has the most control over (not parental involvement, but something like the “Taught” Curriculum).
- May have multiple factors for one strength/weakness. For example, if the weakness is in the reading comprehension, possible contributing factors may be:
 - (a) Teacher’s lack of effective instructional strategies, such as Higher Order Thinking Skills.
 - (b) Lack of effective alignment of taught curriculum to standards and Grade Level Expectations.
 - (c) Lack of effective instructional leadership.
 - (d) Lack of effective time management, a schoolwide positive behavior support system, and/or an attendance policy.
 - (e) Failure to implement effective accommodations and modifications.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Contributing factors are not related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

INTERVENTION MODELS

1. Selected Intervention Model (if correctly implemented) directly and positively influence the contributing factors to the weaknesses found.

- If the contributing factors are not identified, this item is to be rated not acceptable.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Interventions directly address contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Intervention directly addresses contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Intervention does not address contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.
Rationale/Comments:	

2. Interventions are implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Interventions can be implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Intervention can be implemented with available or obtainable resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - The intervention can't be implemented with available or obtainable resources.
Rationale/Comments:	

INTERVENTION MODELS – REQUIRED ELEMENTS (Tier I and II Schools Only)

☐ NOT APPLICABLE, Tier III school

1. All Required elements as present.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
All required elements as outlined in the final requirements are present for the Intervention Model selected.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points – all required elements are present.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points – one or more required elements are missing.
Rationale/Comments:	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

2. If applicable, the LEA has a rigorous review process to select a CSO, CMO, or EMO.

☐ **NOT APPLICABLE**

- The LEA has provided detail as to how they will contact and recruit providers.
- The LEA has provided enough detail to show how they will conduct a rigorous review process of all providers
- The LEA will has taken into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
All required elements as outlined in the final requirements are present for the Intervention Model selected.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points – LEA has a rigorous review process in place.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points – LEA does not have a rigorous review process in place.
Rationale/Comments:	

ACTION PLAN – ACTIVITIES

1. The Action Plan activities are written in a logical, sequential order.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The action plan has a logical sequence of events to reach Desired Outcomes.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the events are in logical order.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most of the events are in a logical order.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few of the events are in logical order.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - None of the events are in logical order.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. The action plan lists the person(s) responsible for the activities.

- Administrators, teachers, and others share in responsibility.
- Position titles of the responsible person(s) must be listed.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The action plan clearly identifies who will be responsible for implementing the activity.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All activities clearly indicate which staff and/or administrators will be responsible for implementing the activity.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most activities clearly state which staff and/or administrators will be responsible.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few activities clearly state who will be responsible, or only one person is responsible for all activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning and the directions for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

3. Activities are clearly described.

Describe what and how the actual activity will be performed by the staff, not a random list. Integrate such areas as literacy and numeracy, professional development, transition, family and community involvement, behavior, and technology.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The action plan clearly states how each activity will be performed.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - It is evident how each activity will be performed.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - It is evident how most activities will be performed.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - There is little evidence of how the activities will be performed.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - There is no evidence of how the activities will be performed.
Rationale/Comments:			

4. Timelines and dates for activities are specific.

- Broad time lines, such as “August through May”, are not sufficient. Use more specific terms, such as monthly, bimonthly, every 2nd Tuesday of the month, weekly, etc.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
A responsible time line is assigned to each activity.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All activities include specific dates.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most activities include specific dates.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few activities include specific dates.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - None of the activities include specific dates.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

ACTION PLAN – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

☐ Professional Development is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Closure or Restart Model)

1. Professional Development activities describe the purpose, type and who will be involved.

- All personnel (teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, and other staff) should be included in appropriate Professional Development opportunities. The use of “instructional staff” or “faculty” in the description is too general to determine which groups of personnel are represented.
- Personnel must be identified by subgroups (teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, support staff, etc).

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Professional Development identifies the purpose of the activities, how the activities will take place, and who will be involved.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for most activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for most activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for few activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for none of the activities. .
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Job – embedded Professional Development provides teachers time to consult together about common instructional problems, engage in joint curriculum planning, share knowledge, observe skills, conduct action research, coach one another, and obtain new ideas and approaches from colleagues during the course of the work day.

Job – embedded Professional Development has three major attributes:

- Relevance – Time is created for the PD to occur as a part of the normal work routine.
- Feedback – Sustained support and attention through mentoring, dialogue, and study groups.
- Transfer of Practice – Self – reflection, action research, peer coaching or observations, and group problem solving.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Professional Development is job – embedded and occurs at least monthly.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Weekly/Bi-weekly job-embedded professional development activities are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - At least monthly job-embedded professional development activities are presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Professional development activities on a monthly basis are presented, but they are not job-embedded.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Professional development activities are not frequent or job-embedded.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

3. Follow-up and support are scheduled activities.

- Look for follow-up and support in the activities and formative evaluation columns with an adequate description.
- Example of follow-up/support: Trainers scheduled to return after initial training to provide additional assistance in implementation; principal, instructional coaches, or Distinguished Educator modeling lessons, practice with feedback, mentoring, videotape analysis, and study groups.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Follow-up/support is an actual scheduled activity and is consistent.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - At least 75% of the activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Less than 75% of the activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Activities do not include scheduled follow-up/support.
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – FAMILY AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- ☐ Family and Community Involvement is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Closure or Restart Model)

1. Family and community involvement activities are clearly linked to the objectives through the strategies.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Family involvement activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - At least 75% of activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - At least 50% of activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Activities are not clearly linked to the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Activities pertaining to content/training involve family members.

- Are a sufficient number of content/training activities included to involve family members in student daily or weekly, or only one time a semester?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Monthly activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Quarterly activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Activities once a semester that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - No activities encourage family members to participate in student learning.
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – MODIFYING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

☐ **Modifying Policies and Practices is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Closure or Restart Model)**

1. The school is committed to modifying existing practices and policies so interventions can be fully and effectively implemented.

- Are the activities selected new and innovative, or are the practices and activities that are already occurring all applicable activities?
- School is clearly moving to reform existing policy and practices.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The school is committed to modifying existing practices and policies so interventions can be fully and effectively implemented			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - activities are not new and innovative; school is not moving to reform the school
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – FUNDING

1. Monetary resources are allocated and aligned to reach identified objectives.

- Is funding provided for all applicable activities? Details in the action plan should indicate how expenses are to be utilized.
- Are the monies being allocated to school improvement?
- Are the monetary resources allocated to the strategies sufficient to make a difference?

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Monetary resources are allocated in a manner that will facilitate achieving the identified objectives.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Monetary resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most monetary resources are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few monetary resources are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Monetary resources are not targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Sufficient time is allocated to achieve the objectives.

- Determine if time is allocated for professional development (i.e., common planning periods, extended school day for professional development, etc.)
- Identify any changes made to improve time on task (i.e., change of school day schedule, classroom management issues, etc.)

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Time is allocated in a manner that will facilitate achieving the objectives.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Time allocations are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most time allocations are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few time allocations are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Time allocations are not targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

3. Human resources are allocated to include a variety of people responsible for the activities.

- Share responsibility among teachers, principals, counselors, and parents.
- Utilize internal and external human resources.
- Use teaching staff for coaching and mentoring.
- Collaborate with the state and community personnel and agencies.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Human resources are allocated in a manner that will facilitate the objectives.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Human resources are not clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING INDICATORS OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. The formative (short term) evaluation procedures to monitor and assess the indicators of implementation for all strategies include at least three of the four of the following criteria:

- (a) What data instrument will be used to collect information and what kind of feedback will be given?
 - (b) What will be measured or assessed, and how will this information be used?
 - (c) Who will conduct the evaluation?
 - (d) How often (frequency)?
- In order for sign-in sheets and workshop evaluations to be acceptable, a description of how they will be used to assess the effectiveness and implementation of the activity must be presented.
 - These evaluation procedures provide documentation of degree of implementation.
 - These evaluation procedures will provide information to determine if the activities are actually implemented in the classroom.

Example:

Classroom observations conducted by the principal and the staff developer will assess the degree of implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skills each quarter and will include feedback, follow-up and support.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Procedures are provided to monitor and assess the indicators of implementation for all strategies set forth in the action plan			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Clear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of indicators for all strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Clear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of indicators for most strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Unclear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of few activities, or some procedures are unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Clear procedures are not provided to evaluate the implementation of indicators for strategies.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. The summative (long-term) evaluation procedures seek to determine if the goals and objectives have been attained.

- Will the summative evaluation adequately convey if the school is improving?
- The summative evaluation should include the applicable testing instruments with descriptions of how they will be used to determine if the goals and objectives are attained.
- This evaluation should include a comparison and/or analysis test data but may also include other types of assessment and/or qualitative data.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Valid procedures are provided to examine the degree to which the identified goals and objectives have been attained.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - Valid procedures are provided to examine the degree to which the goals and objectives have been attained.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Procedures are presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Vague or incomplete procedures are presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Valid procedures are not presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.
Rationale/Comments:			

IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR (GOALS):

1. Goals are directly linked to student learning.

- Look at the overall clarity and presentation of the goals.
- If goals are accomplished, will the school improve academically?

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
I. The goals are linked to student learning and clearly state the direction of school improvement.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - The goals are clearly link to student learning and state the direction for school improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - The goals are linked to student learning and state the direction for school improvement in a relatively clear manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - The link between the goals and student learning and school improvement is unclear or weak.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning and the directions for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Goals address the weaknesses with top priority being in Academic Achievement.

- The goals should be derived from data from the following sources: PAWS, MAP, Attendance and/or Dropout Graduation Rate, DRA, DIBELS, Pre-K/Kindergarten Screening tests, or other standardized teacher – made unit assessments.
- Should limit goals to one (1) or two (2).
- Exception: If the goals are stated in measurable terms, they must use accurate measures to receive a rating no higher than a ‘b’.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The goals accurately address the schools weaknesses in Academic Achievement.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points – All weaknesses are clearly addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most weaknesses are addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - It indirectly refers to learning for all students.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - It does not directly or indirectly refer to learning for all students.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

DESIRED OUTCOMES (OBJECTIVES)

1. Objectives presented are accurate and verifiable in relation to growth.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The objectives have measureable (verifiable) outcomes.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the objectives can be verified/measured.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most of the objectives can be verified/measured.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few of the objectives can be verified/measured.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - None of the objectives can be verified/measured.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Each objective is clearly linked to a specified goal.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Each objective is clearly linked to a specified goal and clearly states the direction of school improvement.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and state the direction for school improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and state the direction for school improvement in a relatively clear manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 point - Few of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and school improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning, and the direction for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

BUDGET

1. Budget is set, matched to expenditures, sufficient for all activities associated with the intervention model selected, and is for the whole life of the grant cycle.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Budget accurate and fiscally responsible.			
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 points - All expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives over the whole grant cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Most expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives over the whole grant cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - Most expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - There is little or no alignment of the expenditures with the project activities.
Rationale/Comments:			

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Funding or Impact Study

☐ Funding or Impact Study is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Closure)

1. Timeline for Funding or Impact Study will be completed with sufficient time prior to the end of grant funds to allow for continuation of the intervention and activities implemented.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Funding or Impact study can be completed with sufficient time to allow for continuation of intervention and activities implemented.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Study can be completed with sufficient time.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - The Study can't be completed with sufficient time.
Rationale/Comments:	

2. Funding or impact study is to be implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Funding or Impact study can be implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 points - Study can be implemented with available or obtainable resources.	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 points - The Study can't be implemented with available or obtainable resources.
Rationale/Comments:	

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I 1003 g SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS
2011-2014**

Schools Served with FY2009 SIG Funds							
LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
Carbon #2	5601700	HEM Junior/Senior High School	00385		X		
Goshen #1	5602990	Trail Elementary	00488			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Triumph High School	00092		X		X
Laramie #1	5601980	Pioneer Park Elementary	00118			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Roosevelt High School	00256		X		X
Teton #1	5605830	Colter Elementary	00289			X	

Schools Eligible for FY2010 SIG Funds

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Albany #1	5600730	Whiting High School	00066		X		
Albany #1	5600730	Velma Linford Elementary	00014			X	
Big Horn #3	5603170	Greybull Middle School	00378			X	
Big Horn #4	5601090	Riverside High School	00036			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Rawhide Elementary	00071			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Lakeview Elementary	00070			X	
Campbell #1	5601470	Meadowlark Elementary	00069			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Cooperative High	00147	X			
Carbon #1	5601030	Pershing Elementary	00033	X			
Carbon #1	5601030	Mountain View Elementary	00032			X	
Carbon #1	5601030	Rawlins Middle School	00028			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Moss Agate Elementary	00130			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Intermediate School	00352			X	
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Primary School	00128			X	
Converse #2	5602150	Glenrock High School	00137		X		
Crook #1	5602370	Hulett School	00407			X	
Fremont #1	5602870	Pathfinder High School	00154	X			
Fremont #1	5602870	North Elementary	00199			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Elementary	00226	X			
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Middle School	00386			X	
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian High School	00441			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	00354	X			
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Elementary	00498			X	
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Middle School	00370			X	
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni High School	00323		X		
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni Junior High School	00510			X	
Fremont #25	5605220	Aspen Park Elementary	00292			X	
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Elementary	00162			X	
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Charter High School	00367	X			X
Johnson #1	5603770	Meadowlark Elementary	00380			X	

Johnson #1	5603770	Buffalo High School	00187			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Cole Elementary	00102			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Johnson Junior High School	00094			X	
Laramie #2	5604120	Burns Elementary	00504			X	
Laramie #2	5604120	Pine Bluffs Jr & Sr High School	00210			X	
Lincoln #1	5604030	Kemmerer Alternative School	00358		X		X
Lincoln #2	5604060	Swift Creek High School	00193		X		X
Natrona #1	5604510	Mountain View Elementary	00248			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Bar Nunn Elementary	00445			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Cottonwood Elementary	00377			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	C Y Junior High School	00232			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Evansville Elementary	00237			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Frontier Middle School	00374			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Middle School	00215			X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Elementary	00219			X	
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater High School	00391		X		X
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater Junior High School	00509			X	
Platte #2	5603180	Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	00499			X	
Sheridan #2	5605695	Ft. Mackenzie	00189	X			X
Sublette #9	5601260	Big Piney Elementary	00043			X	
Sublette #9	5601260	La Barge Elementary	00044			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Lincoln Elementary	00299			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Rock Springs East Junior High	00295			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Desert View Elementary	00298			X	
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Westridge Elementary	00422			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Expedition Academy	00164		X		
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Truman Elementary	00425			X	
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Lincoln Middle School	00399			X	
Teton #1	5605830	Summit High School	00512		X		
Teton #1	5605830	Jackson Elementary	00313			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	North Evanston Elementary	00433			X	
Uinta #1	5602760	Aspen Elementary	00462			X	
Uinta #4	5604500	Mountain View Middle School	00388			X	
Weston #1	5604830	Newcastle Middle School	00264			X	

Schools Served with FY2009 SIG Funds

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	School NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
Carbon #2	5601700	HEM Junior/Senior High School	00385		X		
Goshen #1	5602990	Trail Elementary	00488			X	
Laramie #1	5601980	Triumph High School	00092		X		X
Laramie #1	5601980	Pioneer Park Elementary	00118			X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Roosevelt High School	00256		X		X
Teton #1	5605830	Colter Elementary	00289			X	

Waiver Request Documentation and Comments

Email sent to all Title I Directors and Committee of Practitioners

Good afternoon all,

The Wyoming Department of Education is in the process of completing the 2011-2013 School Improvement Grant Section 1003(g) application with the US Department of Education. As part of this application process the WDE can request to waive certain requirements associated with these funds. The WDE has submitted the waiver requests in the previous year's grant however in order to remain in compliance we must notify and provide time for comments to our stakeholders.

The waivers the WDE will be requesting are as follows:

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The section of the application detailing the waiver requests is attached to this email. We ask that you please review and send any comments to Clementina Jimenez at cjimen@educ.state.wy.us. Comments will be accepted beginning January 21, 2011 until February 20, 2011.

We appreciate your time and assistance with this review. Should you have any questions regarding these waiver request please don't hesitate to contact us.

Thank you,

Clementina Jimenez
Wyoming Department of Education
Title I Program Manager
2300 Capitol Avenue
1st Floor Hathaway Building
Cheyenne WY 82002
Office: 307-777-5792
Cell: 307-286-1305
cjimen@educ.state.wy.us

Public Comment on the Wyoming Department of Education's Waiver Request:

I have reviewed the waiver requests and fully support them.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Martin

I fully support the requested waivers, especially the 40% poverty rule. Wyoming is such a small state, population wise, that just a couple of kids can change the percentage in many of our schools. It ends up on Title one year then off the next, which makes it impossible to provide a coherent program for Title I students. Brent

I have read the request and do not have any comments other than it looks good. We do not qualify for these so I guess I can't say much. I hope we get our Title I expenditures down so we are below the 15% carry over or I could be in trouble.

Thanks

R. J. Kost
Park County School District #1
Powell, Wyoming 82435
Office: 307-764-6186
E-Mail: rjk@pcsd1.net

All public comment was compiled by Clementina Jimenez, Wyoming State Title I Director